

**From:** Roy Seneca/R3/USEPA/US  
**Sent:** 4/12/2012 9:14:00 AM

**To:** Dennis Carney/R3/USEPA/US@EPA  
**CC:** Kathy Hodgkiss/R3/USEPA/US@EPA

# Ex. 5 - Deliberative

Roy Seneca  
EPA Region 3 Press Officer  
Office of Public Affairs  
seneca.roy@epa.gov  
(215) 814-5567

----- Forwarded by Roy Seneca/R3/USEPA/US on 04/12/2012 09:11 AM -----

**From:** Roy Seneca/R3/USEPA/US  
**To:** "Pierre Bertrand" <p.bertrand@ibtimes.com>  
**Cc:** Terri-A White/R3/USEPA/US@EPA  
**Date:** 04/10/2012 04:21 PM  
**Subject:** Re: EPA and Dimock

Pierre -- I hope this helps you out.

I was wondering if the EPA would like to respond to comments given to me suggesting the Maximum Detection Limits are set too high, and thus do not accurately measure compounds and toxic substances found in the water.

The detection limits listed in the data reports are typically what the laboratory would call a quantitation limit. Quantitation limits are established by the analytical method and instrumentation capabilities and are the minimum concentration of an analyte that can be measured within specified limits of precision and accuracy. Classes of compounds are generally analyzed using the same laboratory method. For example, Benzo(a)pyrene and other poly-aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) are classified as semi-volatile organic compounds, which were analyzed using Method 8270D, with a quantitation limit (QL) of 5 ug/l; which as acknowledged is higher than the MCL. With that said lab personnel can typically detect that a chemical is present at values below the QL and can reasonably estimate a concentration that is then reported and validated. In this case the lab is confident that they could detect at levels below both the QL and the MCL. Because the value cannot be precisely stated from the instrument, it is qualified as "J", estimated.

For contaminants that were found in the first two rounds of homes that do not have a designated maximum contaminant levels (MCL), our toxicologists and risk assessors thoroughly reviewed all the toxicological data and concluded that none of the levels detected present a significant health concern.

Additionally, I would like to know if the EPA's water quality assessments in Dimock take into account continued and chronic exposure to the chemicals found in the water. There are fears that though it is considered safe on a one time basis, that if residents keep consuming and using their water over time, the exposure to the compounds found will prompt health complications. What are your thoughts?

EPA found no levels that present a health concern based on risk assessments performed by EPA toxicologists. In performing risk assessments, the toxicologists consider chronic (long term) as well as acute (ie. immediate) conditions.

Roy Seneca  
EPA Region 3 Press Officer  
Office of Public Affairs  
seneca.roy@epa.gov  
(215) 814-5567

From: "Pierre Bertrand" <p.bertrand@ibtimes.com>  
To: Roy Seneca/R3/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 04/10/2012 03:18 PM  
Subject: EPA and Dimock

Hello Roy,

Terri White should be forwarding you an email I sent to her earlier this afternoon regarding some questions I have on the EPA water quality tests conducted in Dimock. I sent my questions to her earlier this afternoon, but she could not get to them right away.

I've pasted them in this email to you. Do you think you could get back to me by the end of the day today? I appreciate your help on this. --Pierre

I was wondering if the EPA would like to respond to comments given to me suggesting the Maximum Detection Limits are set too high, and thus do not accurately measure compounds and toxic substances found in the water.

Additionally, I would like to know if the EPA's water quality assessments in Dimock take into account continued and chronic exposure to the chemicals found in the water. There are fears that though it is considered safe on a one time basis, that if residents keep consuming and using their water over time, the exposure to the compounds found will prompt health complications. What are your thoughts?